

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the reasons that follow.

New claim 16 is currently being added. Support for new claim 16 can be found at least in Figure 16C and the description on page 23 of the specification. No new matter has been added.

Claims 2, 4, 6, 8, 10 and 12-16 are now pending in this application.

Information Disclosure Statement

Applicant has not received an initialed PTO SB/08 form for the IDS filed on March 27, 2002. The Examiner is again requested to provide the initialed PTO form in accordance with MPEP § 609.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 2, 4, 6, 8, 10 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over USP 5,204,820 to Strobel et al. (hereafter “Strobel”) in view of Japanese patent application JP 04197510 (hereafter “JP ‘510”). Claims 13-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Strobel in view of JP ‘510, and further in view of USP 3,611,184 to Moore (hereafter “Moore”). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Independent claim 2 is directed to a lamp device for a vehicle and requires the features: (1) a lens formed in a recess shape in a vertical cross section and a horizontal cross section, and (2) that the reflection surface of the reflector is structured such that a vertical cross section of the reflection surface and a horizontal cross section of the reflection surface each substantially has a shape that is part of an oval larger than a front surface and a back surface of the lens. Stroebel does not disclose or suggest these features of claim 2, nor their attendant advantages.

Stroebel does not disclose that the lens 2 of its headlight is formed in a recess shape in a vertical cross section and a horizontal cross section. The lens 2 of Stroebel is shown in

Figure 1 and discussed in col. 6, lines 28-52. Neither Figure 1 nor col. 6, lines 28-52 of Stroebel, however, discloses that the lens is formed in a recess shape in a vertical cross section and a horizontal cross section. Thus Stroebel does not disclose this feature of claim 2.

Stroebel also does not disclose that the reflection surface of the reflector 1 is structured such that a vertical cross section of the reflection surface and a horizontal cross section of the reflection surface each substantially has a shape that is part of an oval larger than a front surface and a back surface of the lens 2. The Office Action appears to acknowledge this lack in Stroebel, stating that Stroebel “disclose the instant claimed inventions except for the oval shape of the reflector being larger than a front and back surface of the lens.”

JP ‘510 and Moore fail to suggest that Stroebel should be modified to include either features (1) or (2).

With respect to feature (1), JP ‘510 fails to disclose that the collimator lens 1 is formed in a recess shape in a vertical cross section and a horizontal cross section. Thus, even if Stroebel and JP ‘510 were combined, the resultant structure would not include feature (1) of claim 2.

With respect to feature (2), JP ‘510 provides no motivation to modify Stroebel so that both the vertical cross section of the reflection surface and the horizontal cross section of the reflection surface of the reflector 1 each substantially have a shape that is part of an oval larger than a front surface and a back surface of the lens 2. The Office Action alleges that it would have been obvious to modify Stroebel in order to transmit reflected light to an external section with a desired light distribution. The Office Action fails to provide any indication, however, that enlarging the reflector of Stroebel would provide a light distribution *desired in the Stroebel system*.

Moreover, modifying the Stroebel head light to enlarge the reflector as suggested in the Office Action would render the Stroebel device unfit for its intended purpose. The optics of the Stroebel headlight are such as to provide a light distribution desired by Stroebel. Modifying the Stroebel headlight to enlarge the reflector as suggested in the Office Action would change the light distribution, and thus change the light distribution from that desired by

Stroebebel to some other distribution. Such a change would render the Stroebebel head light unfit for its intended purpose, which is to provide the light distribution desired by Stroebebel.

Moore, which is applied with respect to dependent claims 13-15, also fails to cure the deficiencies of Stroebebel. Moore was cited for allegedly disclosing a biconcave lens or a lens with a first surface that is concave and a second surface that is convex. Moore is directed to an optical system for a *laser*, not a head light. The Office Action provides no motivation for why one skilled in the art would modify the lens of the *headlight* system of Stroebebel to include a lens of a *laser* system, such as that of Moore. The Office Action argues that it would have been obvious to include the “biconcave lens as taught by Moore in order to refract the light reflected from the reflector” or the “concave-convex [lens], as taught by Moore . . . in order to refract the light reflected from the reflector.” Significantly, however, the Office Action fails to provide a reason why one skilled in the art would want to “refract the light from the reflector” using the lenses of Moore. The lens of Stroebebel also acts to refract the light from its reflector. The Office Action fails to provide a reason why one skilled in the art would desire to substitute the lenses of Moore, used in a laser system, for the one of Stroebebel, used in a headlight, to refract the light in a different fashion.

Moreover, the Office Action still does not address applicant’s previous arguments that the specification (at page 20, line 11 – page 23, line 23) provides evidence of the unexpected and improved results over the prior art. This secondary consideration must be taken into account when rendering an obviousness rejection.

Features (1) and (2) result in a number of advantages. With respect to feature (1), when the vertical cross-section and the horizontal cross-section are formed in a recess shape, the reflection surface of the reflector of the lamp will be barely visible from outside the lens. Further with respect to the combination of the features (1) and (2), a large quantity of light is provided even if the light emitting area of the lamp is small. As a consequence there is no need to carry out processes related to finishing of the reflection surface of the reflector to prevent the appearance of the lamp device from being degraded because the reflection surface is visible through the lens. Moreover, space for mounting the lamp device can be saved since the light emitting area can be reduced. By contrast, the cited reference are not directed to

achieving such effects, nor is there motivation to combine them to arrive at the invention as claimed.

Thus, for at least the reasons stated above, applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are allowable over the cited art.

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date May 18, 2004

By Thomas G. Bilodeau

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP

Customer Number: 22428

Telephone: (202) 945-6162

Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

Pavan K. Agarwal

Registration No. 40,888

Thomas G. Bilodeau

Registration No. 43,438

Attorneys for Applicant